

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/019,004	04/22/2002	Jinhua An	22001-0003	5123
	590 10/15/2004		EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD			MELLER, MICHAEL V	
MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/019,004	AN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael V. Meller	1654			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If th - If NO - Faile Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri- ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma- led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a preply within the statutory minimum of thir od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	July 2004.				
		his action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 21-28 and 39 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withded claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 21-28, 39 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and the papers.	rawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Exami					
10)[_]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		` '			
11)[	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the		• •			
Prioritv ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) <u> </u>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachmeni	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	<b>∧</b> □	(DTO 442)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	_	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 21-28, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dan Bensky et al., Hson-Mou Chang et al., Chu et al., CN 1047806 or EP 441278.

Applicant argues that the references do not expressly state that the extracts are proteins but these proteins that applicant claims, come from the same plant as shown by the references. What is isolated is a plant extract or the protein from the plant, Astragalus membranaceus. The characteristics of these extracts are inherent to the extract and the plant it comes from. Thus, the claimed characteristics of the protein from the plant are inherent to the plant and since the same plant is extracted as claimed, then the same protein with the same characteristics is yielded. The references teach using standard techniques for purification and thus the extracts will have the same characteristics as in applicant's invention. The argument that the proteins yielded will be different is simply not true. The same plant was used and thus the extract will contain the same protein. How could it be different? Unless the plant is different in the prior art

Art Unit: 1654

versus applicant's invention it is not possible for the protein from the same plant to be different.

Applicant has <u>not</u> established that the products in the references and that of the instant claims are allegedly distinct from each other.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-28, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dan Bensky et al., Hson-Mou Chang et al., Chu et al., CN 1047806 or EP 441278.

The teachings of the references are above. The claims are obvious since the extract is purified by known techniques. It would clearly have been within the purview of the skilled artisan to purify the claimed extract using standard biochemical extraction techniques for plants to yield the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,004

Art Unit: 1654

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

Page 4

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 571-272-0967. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael V. Meller Primary Examiner Art Unit 1654

**MVM**